

PCT

REC'D	16	MOA	2004

WIPO PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

1	Applicant's or agent's file reference JKH/P102834PCT International application No. PCT/GB 03/04082		FOR FURTHER ACTION Se	ee Notification of Transmittal of International reliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)	
			International filing date (day/month/yo	Priority date (day/month/year) 10.10.2002	
interna A61N		ent Classification (IPC) or	both national classification and IPC		
Applica MICF		S LIMITED et al.			
1.	This inte Authority	rnational preliminary ex and is transmitted to the	camination report has been prepared ne applicant according to Article 36.	by this International Preliminary Examining	
2.	This RE	PORT consists of a total	of 5 sheets, including this cover st	neet.	
	This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e. sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).				
	These a	nnexes consist of a tota	al of 4 sheets.		
3 :	This rep	ort contains indications	relating to the following items:	ant de l'estant Contribue del del deste de la companya de la companya de la companya de la companya de la comp	
	Ťhis rep Ι ⊠	ort contains indications Basis of the opinion		ant an Eulard E. Helle of the action of the second contribution and a characteristic and	
		Basis of the opinion Priority	·		
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment	of opinion with regard to novelty, inv	entive step and industrial applicability	
	! ⊠ II □	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention	entive step and industrial applicability	
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention		
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention Int under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard t Lations supporting such statement Cited		
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse reasoned statemer citations and explant Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention at under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to attions supporting such statement cited an international application	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;	
		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse reasoned statemer citations and explant Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention Int under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard t Lations supporting such statement Cited	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;	
a'.		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse reasoned statemer citations and explant Certain documents Certain defects in the	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to attions supporting such statement cited The international application is on the international application.	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;	
Date		Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inve Reasoned statemer citations and explan Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention It under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to attions supporting such statement cited The international application is on the international application.	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;	
Date of 10.00	I SIII SIII SIII SIII SIII SIII SIII S	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse Reasoned statemer citations and explant Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation sion of the demand	of opinion with regard to novelty, investion In under Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to actions supporting such statement cited The international application is on the international application. Date of contraction of the international application is action.	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;	
Date of 10.00	I	Basis of the opinion Priority Non-establishment of Lack of unity of inverse Reasoned statemer citations and explant Certain documents Certain defects in the Certain observation sion of the demand	of opinion with regard to novelty, invention Intunder Rule 66.2(a)(ii) with regard to actions supporting such statement cited The international application is on the international application. Date of continuous actions.	entive step and industrial applicability to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; completion of this report O04	

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/04082

1	Basis	of the	report
1.	Dasis	OI HIG	I CP CI L

1 31 35 35

 With regard to the elements of the international application (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report since they do not contain amendments (Rules 70.16 and 70.17)):

	Des	cription, Pages	
	2-9		as originally filed
1			received on 22.10.2004 with letter of 19.10.2004
	Clai	ms, Numbers	
	1-18		received on 22.10.2004 with letter of 19.10.2004
,	Drav	wings, Sheets	
	1/7-7	717	as originally filed
2.	With lang	regard to the langua uage in which the inte	ge, all the elements marked above were available or furnished to this Authority in the ernational application was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
	The	se elements were ava	ailable or furnished to this Authority in the following language: , which is:
		the language of a tra	nslation furnished for the purposes of the international search (under Rule 23.1(b)).
			cation of the international application (under Rule 48.3(b)).
		the language of a traingle 55.2 and/or 55.3	nslation furnished for the purposes of international preliminary examination (under 3): ***********************************
3.	With	n regard to any nucle rnational preliminary e	otide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application, the examination was carried out on the basis of the sequence listing:
		contained in the inter	national application in written form.
		filed together with the	e international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequen	atly to this Authority in written form.
		furnished subsequen	ntly to this Authority in computer readable form.
		The statement that the in the international a	he subsequently furnished written sequence listing does not go beyond the disclosure pplication as filed has been furnished.
		The statement that the listing has been furnitude.	he information recorded in computer readable form is identical to the written sequence ished.
4.	The	amendments have re	esulted in the cancellation of:
		the description,	pages:
		the claims,	Nos.:
		the drawings,	sheets:

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

International application No.

PCT/GB 03/04082

	5	Π _.	This report has been establis been considered to go beyon	hed as d the d	if (some of) isclosure as	the amendm filed (Rule 7	nents had not been made, since they have '0.2(c)).	
			(Any replacement sheet cont report.)	aining s	such amend	lments must i	be referred to under item 1 and annexed to this	
	6.	Add	itional observations, if necess	ary:				
	III.	Nor	n-establishment of opinion v	vith reg	gard to nov	elty, inventi	ve step and industrial applicability	
	1.	The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non-obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:						
			the entire international application,					
		\boxtimes	claims Nos. 12-18					
			because:					
			the said international application, or the said claims Nos. relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (specify):					
			the description, claims or drawings (indicate particular elements below) or said claims Nos. are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (specify):					
			the claims, or said claims Nos. are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opini could be formed.					
		×	no international search repor	t has be	een establis	shed for the s	aid claims Nos. 12-28	
andrew (1887)	<u>,2,</u>	A meaningful international preliminary examination cannot be carried out due to the failure of the nucleotide and or amino acid sequence listing to comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions:						
			the written form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard.					
			the computer readable form has not been furnished or does not comply with the Standard.					
	٧.	. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement						
	1.	Sta	tement					
		Novelty (N)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-11	e main estable in	
		Inventive step (IS)		Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-11	·	
		Ind	ustrial applicability (IA)	Yes: No:	Claims Claims	1-11		
	2	Cits	ations and evolunations					

see separate sheet

EXAMINATION REPORT - SEPARATE SHEET

Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

1. No examination will be carried out in respect of claims 12 to 18, because they are original claims 13-19 which have not been searched (see Art. 17(2)(a) or (3) PCT, Rule 66.1(e) PCT and the international search report).

Re Item V

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

2. Reference is made to the following documents:

> D1: US-A-4 446 874 (VAGUINE VICTOR A) 8 May 1984 (1984-05-08) D3: EP-A-0 294 854 (UNIV GLASGOW) 14 December 1988 (1988-12-14)

- 3. **INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1**
- 3.1 The document D1 is regarded as being the closest prior art to the subject-matter of claim 1, and shows (the references in parentheses applying to this document) a microwave applicator (see abstract, lines 1-3) comprising:
 - a coaxial electrical input (see col. 7, lines 49-51 and figure 4 (132));

and a contract of the contract of the contract of the property of the contract of the contract

- a waveguide filled with dielectric (see col. 5, lines 25-27 and 50-53); and
- an inner conductor of the coaxial input extending longitudinally within one end of the waveguide (see col. 7, lines 45-60 and figure 4).

The subject-matter of claim 1 differs from D1 in that microwaves in the TM_{p1} are launched. The subject-matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (Article 33(2) PCT).

3.2. The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as how to select the mode of the microwaves.

The solution to this problem proposed in claim 1 of the present application is considered as involving an inventive step (Article 33(3) PCT) for the following reasons:

The apparatuses disclosed in D1 explicitly operate in the TE₀₁ or the TE₁₁ mode

depending on whether a rectangular or a cylindrical waveguide is used (see col. 6, lines 41-49). Therefore, the person skilled in the art would not even consider modifying these known apparatuses in order to make them launch microwaves in the TM_{01} mode.

Furthermore, document D3, which is the only available prior art document referring to the TM₀₁ mode of propagation, discloses (see abstract and figure 8) a microwave thermography apparatus comprising a cylindrical waveguide capable of supporting both the TE₁₁ and the TM₀₁ mode and a mode transformer in the shape of a rod in order to block the TM₀₁ mode and thus leave the TE₁₁ mode only.

Consequently, the subject-matter of claim 1 involves an inventive step (Art. 33(3) EPC).

4. CLAIMS 2-8

Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1 and as such also meet the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

5. CLAIMS 9-11

Claim 9 comprises all the features of claim 1 and is therefore not appropriately formulated as a claim dependent on the latter (Rule 6.4 PGT). Consequently, and claim 9 also meets the requirements of the PCT with respect to novelty and inventive step.

a 51:

The same applies to claims 10-11, which are dependent on claim 9 and thus on claim also.

Form PCT/Separate Sheet/409 (Sheet 2) (EPO-April 1997)

Br. Oak